

**Reviewer # 1** (Citizen Name / Ex. 6) **Comments****Suggested language changes:**

1- "No opportunistic pathogens, heavy metals, VOCs, or other water contaminations were detected in this study and the water produced by the Water Gen 350 atmospheric water generator was safe for human consumption. The water produced meets or exceeds EPA water standards."

2- "Any water exposed to ambient air and not stored in a sealed container has the potential for microbial growth. Consequently, water storage containers should always include an anti microbial application, such as chlorine or Ozone."

**Suggestions regarding LCA:**

1- Any mention of Ecolobue is confusing at best since this company never produced any equipment that confirmed their advertised abilities. The company no longer functions.

2- We would also appreciate using our advertised production capabilities of 5,000 liters per day in the calculations and not the 3,000 liters per day that was used. We actually produce 6,000 liters per day, but 5,000 liters is fair.

**Reviewer # 2** (Citizen Name / Ex. 6) **Comments****Suggested language changes:**

1- A description on how AWG can be used under various disaster types (hurricane vs tornado vs harmful algal bloom in drinking water sources) is needed. I wasn't sure which kinds of disaster/emergency scenarios the study is including.

2- Is it possible to run AWG when power outage occurs during and after disasters?

3- How is AWG compared with other emergency water purification technologies?

**Reviewer # 3** (Citizen Name / Ex. 6) **Comments****Suggested language changes:**

The reviewer has provided detailed comments in the text of the manuscript;  
*Comments around typos, gramatical errors, suggested explanation of words, phrases and othyer suggestions to improve the text of the manuscript*

**Reviewer # 4** (Citizen Name / Ex. 6) **Comments**

1- Is it realistic that, in an emergency or post-disaster scenario when potable water is scarce or unavailable, people would drink from a re-usable glass and then wash it, particularly in a dishwasher?

**2-** Also, in such a scenario, would the price paid for bottled water be the same as the price paid by consumers in a grocery store?

**3-** Reviewer has also made some notes on the manuscript with a small number of typographical corrections and a few other minor suggestions such as:

*Explain the assumptions around travel distances selected*

*Explain any environmental impact of removing moisture from air*

#### Plan of Action

This comment is for Michael Jahne's report.

This comment is for Michael Jahne's report.

Keep Ecolobblue text as the company was operational when the study was conducted. We can note any change in company operation in the text, and describe that additional data points are useful for determining a range of results.

3,000 was value reported in multiple sources at the time of the study. We can list these sources and also include a sensitivity with max water production volume modeled at 5,000 liters per day.

#### Plan of Action

Specify this study is reflective of response to a long-term contamination situation, and we did not examine rapid response to a weather-related disaster etc. in detail.

Note this was not assessed in study (see previous response). May be assessed in future project steps.

It is not in the scope of this study to add new technologies. We could add a sentence describing other possible technologies not assessed.

#### Plan of Action

Address the comments provided in the manuscript. There are no content-related comments from the reviewer.

#### Plan of Action

Provide additional explanation around why the dishwasher scenario was selected and how it applies to the emergency situation being considered

Provide additional text around how during a disaster the bottled water is provided by the local or state government and the price is not the same as that paid by consumers in grocery store. The cost analysis is based on the grocery store and vendor prices as data not available for the prices the government is charged in emergency situation although assumptions can be made. Also potentially look at ranges for cost of AWG unit if only used over lifetime of a specific long-term contamination emergency.

Address reviewer's comments provided in the manuscript. Explain the assumptions around travel distances selected for delivery of bottled water and, for AWG systems for recycling purposes and add that any environmental impacts of removing moisture from air are out of scope of this study.

**Action Taken**

None

None

Added text in Section 1.2.2.1 to address this comment

Addressed this comment as a footnote to Table 1 in the text. The sensitivity analysis has also been revised to model maximum water production up to 5,000 liters per day for the large scale unit. Note that daily water production was not a determining factor in most AWG results.

**Action Taken**

Addressed this comment in the Introduction Section

Focused on grid connection only, as now noted in the Introduction and Section 1.2.2.1. We now note potential future steps: alternative options connectivity with solar or wind power sources.

Addressed this comment in the Scope section. No other emergency water purification technologies such as reverse osmosis-based filtration, cartridge filtration systems, solar pasteurizations systems or natural filtration systems were assessed in this study. Bottled water options are the main comparative option investigated.

**Action Taken**

Addressed all comments provided by the reviewer in the manuscript

**Action Taken**

We have excluded "dishwashing" from our analysis and added an option for "no washing" as a scenario to make the scenarios more realistic to potable water supply emergency situations.

Addressed the comment about pricing under emergency situations in Section 1.2.3 and 4.5.

Addressed all comments provided by the reviewer in the manuscript.